

ELECTRONICALLY FILED IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Title : Large-Scale, Fault-Tolerant Audio Conferencing In a Purely Packet-Switched Network
Inventors : Warren E. Baxley et al.
Serial No. : 10/697,810 Filed : 30 October 2003
Examiner : Redentor M. Pasia Art Unit : 2474
Docket : 199-0248US-C Customer : 29855

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Table of Contents

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	3
III.	STATUS OF CLAIMS	3
IV.	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	3
V.	SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	3
VI.	GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	5
VII.	ARGUMENT	6
	A. Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,937,597 to Rosenberg et al. (“Rosenberg”).....	6
	Summary of Rosenberg.....	8
	Discussion Regarding Claim 40.....	10
	B. Claims 3, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,995,608 to Detample Jr. et al. (“Detample”) in view of Rosenberg	14
	Discussion Regarding Claim 7.....	14
	C. Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,339 to Thomas (“Thomas”)...	17
	D. Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,463 to Jurkevics et al. (“Jurkevics”)	17
	E. Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,392 to Semaan (“Semaan”)	18
	F. Conclusion	18
VIII.	Claims Appendix	20
IX.	Evidence Appendix	26
X.	Related Proceedings Appendix	27

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Polycom, Inc. is the real party in interest.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

None.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-2, 11 and 16-31 are cancelled. Claims 3-5, 7-10, 12-15 and 40 are rejected.

Claims 6 and 32-39 are withdrawn. Claims 3-5, 7-10, 12-15 and 40 are appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

On 07 September 2010 Appellant filed a response to Final Office Action dated 07 July.

That amendment was entered by the Examiner. There are no pending amendments.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

This section provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings by reference characters as required by 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(l)(v). Page and line numbers refer to the Specification as filed on 30 October 2003. Citation to the specification and/or drawings does not imply that limitations from the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element. Additionally, references are not necessarily exhaustive, and various claim elements may also be described at other locations within the specification and/or drawings.

Generally, Appellant claims methods (independent claims 7 and 40) to add additional endpoints to an audio conference system in a purely packet-switched environment by instructing an MCU (Multipoint Control Unit) to place an outbound call to a not already participating endpoint after the MCU has already begun hosting an audio conference.

Independent claim 7 recites a method for adding an additional endpoint to an audio conference in a purely packet-switched audio conferencing system, said method comprising: [See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16 for all elements]

placing a call from an endpoint to a packet-switched conferencing system component, said call indicating an audio conference; [See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16]

selecting, in a conference allocation and control system (170) in said audio conferencing system, a multipoint control unit (160) to host said audio conference; [See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16]

initiating an outbound call request from said selected multipoint control unit (160) to said packet-switched conferencing system component, wherein said call request indicates said additional endpoint (120) which is not already participating in the audio conference; [510-520; 600; also See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16]
returning a destination address from said packet-switched conferencing system

component to said selected multipoint control unit (160), said destination address corresponding to said additional endpoint; [530-540; 635; also See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16] and

establishing a point-to-point outbound call (640) from said multipoint control unit (160) to said additional endpoint (120) based on said destination address, thereby bringing said additional endpoint (120) into said audio conference (650). [520-550; 645-650; also See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16]

Independent claim 40 recites a method of adding an additional endpoint to an already active audio conference, the method comprising: [See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16]

selecting an endpoint (120) not already participating in an audio conference; obtaining a destination address for the selected endpoint (120) from a packet-switched conferencing system component, [See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16] providing the destination address to a multipoint control unit (160) managing the audio conference; [See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16] placing an outbound point to point call from the multipoint control unit (160) to the additional endpoint (120); and [See Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16] adding the additional endpoint (120) to the audio conference. [520-550; 645-650; also *See* Figs. 5 and 6; p. 18 l. 26 to p. 20 l. 16]

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,937,597 to Rosenberg et al. (“Rosenberg”). Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 4-6.

Claims 3, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,995,608 to Detamble Jr. et al. (“Detamble”) in view of Rosenberg. Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 7-11.

Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detamble in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,339 to Thomas (“Thomas”). Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 11-12.

Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detamble in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,463 to Jurkevics et al. (“Jurkevics”). Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 12-13.

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,392 to Semaan (“Semaan”). Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 13-16.

VII. ARGUMENT

The claims do not stand or fall together. Appellant presents an argument explaining the patentability of each independent claim with regard to each of the noted rejections. Each of the dependent claims not separately argued will stand or fall with their respective independent claim. After a concise discussion of the cited art, each ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is presented under a separate heading and sub-heading as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(l)(vii). To aid in review of the Examiner’s rejections, portions of the Final Office Action (dated 07 July 2010) have been copied into this Brief.

A. Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,937,597 to Rosenberg et al. (“Rosenberg”)

The Examiner has made a clear error in rejecting independent claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Rosenberg. Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 4-6.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that:

As to claim 40, Rosenberg shows a method of adding an additional endpoint to an already active audio conference (Figure 3-5; col. 15-16; note multiparty conferencing which allows an already existing conference to include additional conferees through the use of INVITE messages), the method comprising:

selecting an endpoint not already participating in an audio conference (Figure 3-4; col. 5, line 33 to col. 6, lines 35; note user cz 110 wants to communicate with user henning 210 and further sends an INVITE request 300; further note that the method of Figure 4 is also applied to SIP operations including third or later parties in a conference or multicast call; in this instance, since no communication is established with user henning 210 yet, it can be seen the user henning 210 is not yet participating in an audio conference; see also col. 15-16 regarding multiparty conferencing);

obtaining a destination address for the selected endpoint from a packet-switched conferencing system component (Figure 3-4; col. 6, lines 14-18; note location server 230 (i.e. packet-switched conferencing system) returns a location of hgs@play to proxy server 230 as the location of user henning 210),

providing the destination address to a multipoint control unit managing the audio conference (Figure 3-4; col. 6, lines 14-18; note the location (i.e. hgs@play of user henning 210) is returned (i.e. provided) to proxy server 230);

placing an outbound point to point call from the multipoint control unit to the additional endpoint (Figure 3-4; step 310; col. 6, lines 19-24; note that after receiving the location of user henning 210, proxy server 220 sends a new INVITE request to hgs@play. As in step 300, this INVITE request also contains FROM, TO, and CALL-ID header fields. It is particularly noted that the call identifier in the CALL-ID header field is the same, in order to maintain an association with the original request.); and

adding the additional endpoint to the audio conference (Figure 3-4; note steps 320 onward details the ACKs and replies from both the caller (i.e. user cz) and callee (i.e. henning)

through proxy server 220, further establishing the call between both parties. It is further noted that the method in Figure 3 is also applied to third party not yet included in an established communication/conference. The third party is in general the callee to be invited to the conference. See also col. 15-16 regarding inviting additional conferees to multiparty conferencing.).

Final Office Action dated 07 July 2010 at pp. 4-6.

Appellant traverses the rejection for the reasons stated below because the disclosure of Rosenberg as asserted by the Examiner cannot properly support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Summary of Rosenberg

Rosenberg discloses “[a] method for creating, modifying, and terminating connections between Internet end systems, particularly, although not exclusively, for Internet telephony communication. The method relies on several request messages being sent between a client and a server and the response messages sent back in response. Each request and response message may contain one or more header fields which modify or more uniquely link the messages with a given connection. On this basis, advanced telephony services, such as call forwarding, call transferring, and multiparty conferencing are provided.” Rosenberg at Abstract.

Rosenberg further discloses “[t]he basic operation of Internet telephony signaling” at Col. 5 ln. 33 through Col. 7 ln. 34. Rosenberg discloses that “a caller first obtains an address where a callee is to be called ... in the form of name@domain. The domain is then translated ... to an IP address where a suitable server is located. ... Once the server’s IP address is located, the caller sends an INVITE message ... The server receiving the INVITE message *is usually not the host*

where the callee is actually located. Therefore, we define three types of servers: *proxy, redirect and user agent.* ... In general, a *proxy server receives* a request (such as an INVITE message) and then forwards the request towards (i.e., not necessarily to) the current location of the callee. ... A proxy server can also forward an incoming invitation to multiple servers simultaneously, in order to contact a user at one of the locations.”

Rosenberg also discloses “[a]nother service that is possible is multiparty conferencing, in a variety of scenarios. These include multicast conferences, bridged conferences, and full-mesh conferences.” Rosenberg at Col. 15 lns. 3-6. Rosenberg discloses a full-mesh conference does not have an MCU or bridge by stating: “[i]n a full-mesh conference, each participant sends media data to *every other participant and mixes the media from all other participants locally.*” Rosenberg at Col. 15 lns. 7-9. Next, Rosenberg discloses multicast conferences. Multicast addressing is a network technology for the delivery of information to a group of destinations simultaneously using the most efficient strategy to deliver the messages over each link of the network only once (if possible). Rosenberg discloses “[a] client wants to invite a group, represented by a single identifier (friends@isp.com) which maps to a multicast address. Each member of the group listens to the address, and therefore can receive invitations.” Rosenberg at Col. 17 lns. 5-9. Finally, Rosenberg discloses “a dial-in bridge [where] users dial into a number which represents a bridge. The bridge mixes the media from all of the users connected to it, and then returns it to each user. ... Each user *invites the bridge*, and the acceptance response from the bridge indicates the media that the bridge can understand and the port number to which data should be send, as with any other call. All users who send an INVITE to the same URL are

considered part of the same conference. Their respective ***media is mixed***, and the result is sent to each user in accordance with their respective limitations.

In summary, proxy servers receive INVITE requests on behalf of a particular user and then forward that INVITE request to one or more servers in an attempt to locate that particular user. Three types of conferences are disclosed, with the ***bridged*** conference being the only method disclosing mixing of media at a shared location rather than ***mixing locally*** on the client.

Discussion Regarding Claim 40

Independent claim 40 recites, *inter alia*, “placing an outbound point to point call from the multipoint control unit to the additional endpoint” and “multipoint control unit [is] ***managing*** the audio conference.” The Examiner asserts that Rosenberg’s ***proxy server*** anticipates the claimed multipoint control unit. However, as described above, Rosenberg’s proxy server simply cannot be equated with a multipoint control unit. The capability of Rosenberg’s proxy server is to “receive an INVITE request” and forward “the request towards … the current location of the callee.” In contrast, as ***recited in the claim*** and described in Appellant’s Specification at p. 11 lns. 12-24, a multipoint control unit (MCU) “supports audio conferences between three or more endpoints 120” (*i.e.*, ***manages an audio conference***). Clearly, Rosenberg’s proxy server does not manage an audio conference. Even if one were to accept the Examiner’s assertion that Rosenberg’s proxy server can “place an outbound call,” the Examiner has still failed to present a legitimate *prima facie* anticipation rejection because Rosenberg’s proxy server does not perform functions equivalent to the claimed multipoint control unit. Appellant asserts that Rosenberg’s proxy server is fundamentally different from an MCU and does not perform the functions of

either “managing an audio conference” or “placing an outbound call” as expressly recited functions of an MCU in claim 40.

In response to previous arguments, the Examiner asserts three points. Firstly, the Examiner asserts that claim 40 does not require an MCU to support audio conferences between *three or more endpoints*. However, claim 40 clearly recites “an already active audio conference” and “adding the additional endpoint to the audio conference.” Clearly, an already active audio conference has at least two participants and *adding an additional participant* certainly makes at least three. Therefore, the Examiner has incorrectly rebutted Appellant’s arguments with respect to this point.

Secondly, the Examiner asserts “it is explicitly shown … that the use of INVITE messages/requests, in part, manages or prepares calls.” Advisory Action dated 28 September 2010 at p. 3 citing to Rosenberg at col. 3, lines 45-58. However, the management or preparation of calls is wholly different from the managing of an audio conference between three or more participants. As anyone of skill in the art is aware, a MCU performs functions above and beyond managing or preparing calls when performing the claimed function of managing an audio conference.

Thirdly, Appellant believed the Examiner had relied heavily on Rosenberg at col. 15-16 when forming his rejections. In the Advisory Action the Examiner has tried to “correct the Applicant in this notion” and explicitly states he has “relied heavily on Figures 3-4 and its corresponding description in col. 6.” Advisory Action dated 28 September 2010 at p. 4. In reply, Appellant thanks the Examiner for clarifying his rejections and explains to the Board that it is illogical for the Examiner to rely heavily on Figures 3-4 and its corresponding description

because this portion of Rosenberg is in no way directed to an audio conference. Rosenberg at col. 6 is expressly dedicated to explaining an example of a *single user* calling another *single user*. “According to the illustrated example, user cz (110) wants to communicate with user henning (210).” Rosenberg at col. 6 lines 6-7.

Additionally, the Examiner asserts that “[h]aving a ‘new’ INVITE request denotes another call being placed by proxy server.” Advisory Action dated 28 September 2010 at p. 5. With this assertion the Examiner makes clear that his rejection cannot be sustained because the “new” invite request simply does not denote another call. The “new” invite request exemplifies the proxy server performing its standard function (as described in Rosenberg). Rosenberg discloses, “[i]n general, a proxy server receives a request (such as an INVITE message) and then *forwards* the request towards (i.e., not necessarily to) the current location of the callee.” Rosenberg at col. 5 lines 56-58 (emphasis added). The “new” invite request is simply a translated invite request being *forwarded* to server hgs@play because that is where the location server 230 resolved the location of user henning and returned that information to the proxy server. See Rosenberg at col. 6. lines 14-24. As explained above, Rosenberg at col. 5-6 is expressly directed to a *two party* call and the only portion of Rosenberg directed to multiparty conferencing is at col. 15-16. Because Rosenberg at col. 5-6 is directed to two party calling that portion of Rosenberg cannot be reasonably relied on (or heavily relied on) to support an anticipation rejection of claim 40 which is expressly directed to a conference of at least 3 or more participants.

Because the Examiner’s reliance on Rosenberg’s proxy server cannot properly disclose the claimed MCU, the Examiner has failed to present a legitimate *prima facie* case of

anticipation (regarding claim 40 when interpreted as a whole) as required by law and USPTO guidelines. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests the Board withdraw this rejection.

Additionally, the Examiner's assertion that Rosenberg's "proxy server" anticipates the claimed "multipoint control unit" fails for at least the following reasons. The Examiner "notes that the claim limitation 'multipoint control unit' is rejected based on the presented functions performed by the claimed multipoint control unit. Details of the functions at least include 'placing an outbound point to point call from the multipoint control unit to the additional endpoint' as claimed." Final Office Action dated 07 July 2010 at p. 2. However, the Examiner appears to fail to properly interpret the claim "as a whole" because, as recited in claim 40, "multipoint control unit [is] **managing** the audio conference." It is not reasonable to assert Rosenberg's "proxy server" manages the audio conference. Rosenberg expressly states "a proxy server receives a request (such as an Invite message) and then forwards the request towards (i.e., not necessarily to) the current location of the callee." Rosenberg at col. 5 lines 56-58. In other words, Rosenberg's proxy server is used to **determine locations** and not manage audio conferences. Even if one were to accept the Examiner's interpretation that Rosenberg's "proxy server" actually places an outbound call, the Examiner's assertion that Rosenberg's "proxy server" can anticipate the claimed "multipoint control unit" fails when claim 40 is properly interpreted as a whole. For at least this reason, this is clearly not a sustainable rejection, Rosenberg does not disclose anything **arranged** as in independent claim 40 nor does Rosenberg disclose the identical invention in **complete detail** as required by law and USPTO examining guidelines.

B. Claims 3, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,995,608 to Detample Jr. et al. (“Detample”) in view of Rosenberg

The Examiner has made clear error in rejecting claims 3, 7 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,995,608 to Detample Jr. et al. (“Detample”) in view of Rosenberg. Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 7-11.

Discussion Regarding Claim 7

The Examiner admits:

Detampel does not specifically show initiating an outbound call request from said multipoint control unit to said packet-switched conferencing system component, wherein said call request indicates said additional endpoint which is not already participating in the audio conference; returning a destination address from said packet-switched conferencing system component to said selected multipoint control unit, said destination address corresponding to said additional endpoint; and establishing a point-to-point outbound call from said multipoint control unit to said additional endpoint based on said destination address, thereby bringing said additional endpoint into said audio conference.

Final Office Action dated 07 July 2010 at p. 8.

The Examiner again relies on Rosenberg to show “initiating an outbound call request from said multipoint control unit” and equates Rosenberg’s proxy server with the claimed multipoint control unit. However, as shown above with respect to independent claim 40, Rosenberg in no way discloses initiating an outbound call request from a multipoint control unit

which is also managing the audio conference. Rosenberg's proxy server cannot be equated with a multipoint control unit and even if one were to assume Rosenberg's proxy server could be equated to a multipoint control unit (which it cannot) it is not Rosenberg's proxy server that **both** manages the audio conference and initiates an outbound call because Rosenberg's proxy server functions to locate "callees" (*i.e.*, addresses that have been called) and in the **only** specific bridged example (described in Rosenberg at col. 15-16), the proxy server is attempting to locate a callee that has ***already been called***.

The Examiner cites to the example disclosed at Rosenberg's Col. 15-16 regarding inviting additional conferees to multiparty conferencing. As stated above, full-mesh conferencing and multicast conferencing examples disclosed in Rosenberg do not utilize any equipment acting as either a bridge or an MCU and Rosenberg's disclosure at Col. 5-6 is strictly related to ***two-party*** calling. Therefore, the example of adding a call to a "bridge" at Col. 15 lns 37-49 appears to be the only section of Rosenberg that could even be applicable to this rejection with Rosenberg's bridge and not proxy server supporting a plurality of callers. This section is reproduced for reference below:

By way of example, if A, who is part of a bridged conference at M, would like to call B outside of the bridge, and then invite B into the bridged conference. To do this, A invites B. After A and B connect and talk, A invites B again (using the same call identifier) with ALSO set to M. It should be noted that A's SIP application does not know (and does not need to know) that M is actually performing a bridge function. In response to the ALSO set to M, B sends an INVITE to M, including a REQUESTED BY A. This lets M know that A invited B to join the bridge, so that it is possible 40
45

that A is still connected to B directly (not through the bridge). To change this, M invites B, including **REPLACES A**, which causes B to drop A.

Rosenberg at Col. 15 lns. 37-49.

Note in this example A invites B and after A and B connect and talk, A invites B again with ALSO set to M (that is A invites both B and the bridge M). In response to the ALSO set to M, B (the callee) sends an invite to M (the bridge) including a requested by A. The ALSO lets M (the bridge) know that A invited B. Thus the bridge (M) learns the address of B directly from B. Therefore this scenario equates to B (the callee) actually initiating a call *into* the bridge M, not the bridge (M) *initiating an outbound call request* as recited in claim 7. While M (the bridge) does eventually INVITE B, this operation is after the call has been placed by B to the bridge (M). The final INVITE (at the very end of the example) is just to cause a termination of the original call from A directly to B.

Because the bridge (M) learns B's address from B directly, the example also does not meet the claim requirements that the address is obtained "from a packet-switched conferencing system component." Further, any combination of the example multiparty bridge operation with the normal call procedure involving an address lookup (*e.g.* Rosenberg's location server) is improper because such a combination would destroy the operation of each case.

For at least these reasons the Examiner's reliance on Rosenberg is inaccurate. Detample, either alone or in combination with Rosenberg, does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 7. Each of claims 3 and 12 depend from claim 7 and are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons stated above regarding independent claim 7. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to present a legitimate *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by law

and established Patent Office Procedure. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests the Board reverse this rejection.

C. Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,339 to Thomas (“Thomas”)

The Examiner has made clear error when rejecting claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,339 to Thomas (“Thomas”). Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 11-12.

Each of claims 4-5 depend from independent claim 7. Appellant has shown above that neither Detample nor Rosenberg disclose each and every element of independent claim 7. Because Thomas does not disclose the missing elements a combination of Detample, Rosenberg and/or Thomas cannot render dependent claims 4-5 obvious. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests the Board reverse this rejection.

D. Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,463 to Jurkevics et al. (“Jurkevics”)

The Examiner has made clear error when rejecting claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,463 to Jurkevics et al. (“Jurkevics”). Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 12-13.

Each of claims 8-10 depend from independent claim 7. Appellant has shown above that neither Detample nor Rosenberg disclose each and every element of independent claim 7. Because Jurkevics does not disclose the missing elements a combination of Detample, Rosenberg and/or Jurkevics cannot render dependent claims 8-10 obvious. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests the Board reverse this rejection.

E. Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,392 to Semaan (“Semaan”)

The Examiner has made clear error when rejecting claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Detample in view of Rosenberg further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,392 to Semaan (“Semaan”). Final Office Action dated 7 July 2010 at pp. 13-16.

Each of claims 13-15 depend from independent claim 7. Appellant has shown above that neither Detample nor Rosenberg disclose each and every element of independent claim 7. Because Semaan does not disclose the missing elements a combination of Detample, Rosenberg and/or Semaan cannot render dependent claims 13-15 obvious. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests the Board reverse this rejection.

F. Conclusion

For at least the reasons stated above, Appellant respectfully submits that all outstanding rejections should be reversed. To the extent specific claims have not been addressed, these claims depend from one or more claims that are specifically addressed, and are therefore

patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims specifically addressed. Appellant further believes that it has complied with each requirement for an appeal brief.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Appellant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that other limitations may be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

If any fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Deposit Account Number 501922/199-0248US-C.

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Hubbard
William M. Hubbard, J.D.
Reg. No. 58,935

Wong, Cabello, Lutseh, Rutherford & Brueculeri, L.L.P.
Customer No. 29855 Voice: 832-446-2445
20333 SH 249, Suite 600 Mobile: 713-302-4648
Houston, Texas 77070 Facsimile: 832-446-2424
Email: whubbard@counselip.com

VIII. Claims Appendix

1 – 2 (Canceled)

3. (Previously presented) The method of claim 7 wherein the step of placing a call links said endpoint to said packet-switched conferencing system component through said packet-switched audio conferencing system.
4. (Previously presented) The method of claim 7 wherein routing instructions for said audio conference include at least a location found signal indicating the selected multipoint control unit.
5. (Previously presented) The method of claim 7 wherein the call includes at least a location request signal.

6. (Withdrawn) A method of establishing an audio conference in a purely packet-switched audio conferencing system, the method comprising:

initiating a call from an endpoint to said purely packet-switched audio conferencing system, said call indicating said audio conference;

selecting, in a conference allocation and control system in said purely packet-switched audio conferencing system, a multipoint control unit to host said audio conference;

determining in said conference allocation and control system whether the call from said endpoint contains adequate information to establish said audio conference;

responding from said conference allocation and control system to said endpoint with routing instructions to an interactive voice response server when there is inadequate information to establish said audio conference;

connecting said endpoint to said interactive voice response server when there is inadequate information to route said call;

gathering in said interactive voice response server, after connecting said endpoint to said interactive voice response server, said adequate information to establish said audio conference; and

transferring said endpoint from said interactive voice response server to said selected multipoint control unit after said interactive voice response server gathers said adequate information.

7. (Previously presented) A method for adding an additional endpoint to an audio conference in a purely packet-switched audio conferencing system, said method comprising:

placing a call from an endpoint to a packet-switched conferencing system component,
said call indicating an audio conference;
selecting, in a conference allocation and control system in said audio conferencing system, a multipoint control unit to host said audio conference;
initiating an outbound call request from said selected multipoint control unit to said packet-switched conferencing system component, wherein said call request indicates said additional endpoint which is not already participating in the audio conference;
returning a destination address from said packet-switched conferencing system component to said selected multipoint control unit, said destination address corresponding to said additional endpoint; and
establishing a point-to-point outbound call from said multipoint control unit to said additional endpoint based on said destination address, thereby bringing said additional endpoint into said audio conference.

8. (Previously presented) The method of claim 7 further supporting full service audio conferencing using a reservation system and a call agent.

9. (Original) The method of claim 8 wherein the reservation system and the call agent are tightly integrated.

10. (Original) The method of claim 8 wherein the reservation system and the call agent are loosely integrated.

11. (Canceled)

12. (Previously presented) The method of claim 7 further including dynamically routing an operator voice path to service multiple multipoint control units.

13. (Previously presented) The method of claim 7 further including renegotiating the destination of a voice path to move an audio conference participant from said selected multipoint control unit to a second multipoint control unit.

14. (Previously presented) The method of claim 7 further including moving said audio conference from said selected multipoint control unit to a second multipoint control unit.

15. (Previously presented) The method of claim 7 further comprising:
providing said audio conference to a streaming protocol server from said selected multipoint control unit;
connecting a passive participant to said streaming protocol server; and
broadcasting said audio conference from said streaming protocol server to a said passive participant.

Claims 16 – 31 (Canceled)

32. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 6 wherein said selecting said multipoint control unit comprises:

selecting in said conference allocation and control system a first multipoint control unit to host said audio conference when said audio conference is inactive.

33. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 6 wherein said selecting said multipoint control unit comprises:

selecting in said conference allocation and control system a second multipoint control unit to host said audio conference when said audio conference is active.

34. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 6 further comprising:

responding from said conference allocation and control system to said endpoint with queried routing instructions, said queried routing instructions indicating said selected multipoint control unit.

35. (Withdrawn) A method of establishing an audio conference in a packet-switted audio conferencing system, the method comprising:

initiating a call from an endpoint to said packet-switched audio conferencing system, said call indicating said audio conference;

determining in a conference allocation and control system whether the call from said endpoint contains adequate information to establish said audio conference;

responding from said conference allocation and control system to said endpoint with routing instructions to an interactive voice response server when there is inadequate information to establish said audio conference;

connecting said endpoint to said interactive voice response server when there is inadequate information to route said call;

gathering in said interactive voice response server, after connecting said endpoint to said interactive voice response server, said adequate information to establish said audio conference; and

transferring said endpoint from said interactive voice response server to said audio conference after said interactive voice response server gathers said adequate information.

36. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 35 further comprising:
 - selecting, in said conference allocation and control system, a multipoint control unit to host said audio conference.
37. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 36 further including dynamically routing an operator voice path to service multiple multipoint control units.
38. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 36 further including renegotiating the destination of a voice path to move an audio conference participant from said selected multipoint control unit to a second multipoint control unit.
39. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 36 further including moving said audio conference from said selected multipoint control unit to a second multipoint control unit.
40. (Previously presented) A method of adding an additional endpoint to an already active audio conference, the method comprising:
 - selecting an endpoint not already participating in an audio conference;
 - obtaining a destination address for the selected endpoint from a packet-switched conferencing system component,
 - providing the destination address to a multipoint control unit managing the audio conference;
 - placing an outbound point to point call from the multipoint control unit to the additional endpoint; and
 - adding the additional endpoint to the audio conference.

IX. Evidence Appendix

None.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

None.